



UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE
United States Patent and Trademark Office
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS
P.O. Box 1450
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450
www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
09/883,302	06/19/2001	Jeffrey A. Bedell	53470.003004	9726

21967 7590 12/28/2004

HUNTON & WILLIAMS LLP
INTELLECTUAL PROPERTY DEPARTMENT
1900 K STREET, N.W.
SUITE 1200
WASHINGTON, DC 20006-1109

EXAMINER

ALAUBAIDI, HAYTHIM J

ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER
----------	--------------

2161

DATE MAILED: 12/28/2004

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

Office Action Summary	Applicati n No.	Applicant(s)	
	09/883,302	BEDELL ET AL.	
	Examin r	Art Unit	
	Haythim J. Alaubaidi	2161	

-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --

Period for Reply

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE 3 MONTH(S) FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.

- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If the period for reply specified above is less than thirty (30) days, a reply within the statutory minimum of thirty (30) days will be considered timely.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133). Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

Status

- 1) ☒ Responsive to communication(s) filed on 25 June 2004.
- 2a) ☐ This action is **FINAL**. 2b) ☒ This action is non-final.
- 3) ☐ Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

Disposition of Claims

- 4) ☒ Claim(s) 1-24 is/are pending in the application.
- 4a) Of the above claim(s) _____ is/are withdrawn from consideration.
- 5) ☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are allowed.
- 6) ☒ Claim(s) 1-24 is/are rejected.
- 7) ☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are objected to.
- 8) ☐ Claim(s) _____ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

Application Papers

- 9) ☐ The specification is objected to by the Examiner.
- 10) ☒ The drawing(s) filed on 19 June 2001 is/are: a) ☒ accepted or b) ☐ objected to by the Examiner.
Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).
Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correction is required if the drawing(s) is objected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).
- 11) ☐ The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner. Note the attached Office Action or form PTO-152.

Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119

- 12) ☐ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).
- a) ☐ All b) ☐ Some * c) ☐ None of:
1. ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.
2. ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. _____.
3. ☐ Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).
- * See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.

Attachment(s)

- | | |
|--|---|
| 1) <input type="checkbox"/> Notice of References Cited (PTO-892) | 4) <input type="checkbox"/> Interview Summary (PTO-413)
Paper No(s)/Mail Date. _____ |
| 2) <input type="checkbox"/> Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948) | 5) <input type="checkbox"/> Notice of Informal Patent Application (PTO-152) |
| 3) <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO-1449 or PTO/SB/08)
Paper No(s)/Mail Date <u>9/20/02 9/23/02</u> | 6) <input type="checkbox"/> Other: _____ |

DETAILED ACTION

1. This communication is in response to the amendment filed on June 25, 2004.
2. Claims 1-24 are presented for examination following the amendment of June 25, 2004, of which Claims 1, 4, 5, 6, 10, 14, 16, 20, 21, 23 and 24 are independent claims.
3. Claims 1-24, are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a).
4. The Examiner acknowledges the new added claims 23 and 24.

Response to Arguments

5. Applicant's arguments with respect to claims 1-24, have been considered but are moot in view of the new ground(s) of rejection.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103

6. The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

(a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negated by the manner in which the invention was made.

7. Claims 1-24, are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Jean-Yves Cras (U.S. Patent Application Publication No. 2002/0087516 and Cras hereinafter) in view of Cristian Petculescu (U.S. Patent No. 6,473,750 and Petculescu hereinafter).

Regarding Claims 1, 4, 6-7, 10, 16 and 21, Cras discloses:

a syntax pattern selector module for selecting a syntax pattern (Page 15, paragraph [0428]), i.e.

quick parsing checks only the syntax of components, that means the system verifies that the object used in the cadenza object definition exists in the universe definition or in the olap database

in an automated process (Page 1, Paragraph [0020]; see also Page 3, Paragraph [0075]; see also Page 10, Paragraph [0256]; see also Page 11, Paragraph [0301])

corresponding to a desired function (Page 15, Paragraph [0435]), i.e.

an object that contains an error of syntax in its definition due to the use of an unknown function

generating one or more query language statements (Page 1, Paragraph [0011]; see also Page 5, Paragraph [0106]; see also Page 5, Paragraph [0111]; see also Page 11, Paragraph [0291]; see also Page 16, Paragraph [0463]; see also Page 16, Paragraphs [0465], [0467], [0476], [0477], [0481], [0482] and [0485])

a statement assembly module (Page 15, Paragraph [0490]), i.e.

query technique (QT) is responsible for accessing metadata
... provides a semantic layer for building SQL queries

for populating (Page 9, Paragraph [0229]), i.e.

to aggregate the data or group the members

Art Unit: 2161

the syntax pattern (Page 15, Paragraph [0428]) with an argument data set associated with a desired data set (Page 8, Paragraph [0193]), i.e.

The metadata object,---- are objects that define a data source

and whereby at least one query language statement provides a semantic layer for building SQL queries (Page 16, Paragraph [0490]; se also (Page 1, Paragraph [0011]; see also Page 5, Paragraph [0106]; see also Page 5, Paragraph [0111]; see also Page 11, Paragraph [0291]; see also Page 16, Paragraph [0463]; see also Page 16, Paragraphs [0465], [0467], [0476], [0477], [0481], [0482] and [0485])

is assembled to be run against a data source to return the desired data set (Page 17, Paragraph [0504]), i.e.

A SQL expert can craft "user defined SQL filters" specific to a database SQL compliance

Cras reference discloses all of the claimed subject matter set forth above, except it does not explicitly indicate the syntax standard. However, Petculescu discloses the claimed syntax standard (i.e. syntax rules) (Col 6, lines 35-43).

Given the intended broad application of the Cras's system, It would have been obvious to a person of ordinary skill in the art at the time of Applicant's invention to modify the teachings of Cras with the teachings of Petculescu to include syntax standard with the motivation to reduce the size of the data (Petculescu, Column 2, Lines 2-1-7) and analyze data . . . in an efficient manner (Petculescu, Col 1, lines 23-35).

Regarding Claims 2, 9, 11, 15, 19 and 22, Cras discloses wherein the syntax pattern selector module selects the syntax pattern from a plurality of syntax patterns (Page 15, Paragraph [0428]), i.e.

Quick Parsing checks only the syntax of components, that means the system verifies that the object used in the cadenza object definition exists in the universe definition or in the OLAP database)

corresponding to a plurality of database management systems (Figure 1, i.e. (RDBMS and Universe).

Regarding Claims 3 and 12, the limitations of these claims have been noted in the rejected claim 1, above. In addition, Cras discloses selection variable (Page 10, Paragraph [0267]).

Regarding Claims 8 and 18, Cras discloses wherein the system is a component in an online analytical processing system (Figure 1, i.e. OLAP; see also Page 1, Paragraph [0006]), a reporting system, a business intelligence system, or a data mining system (Page 14, Paragraph [0403]).

Regarding Claims 13 and 17, Petculescu discloses generating a query structure based on the desired data set, the query structure providing a basis for identifying the desired function (Figure 4 and corresponding text).

Regarding Claim 5, 14, 20, 23 and 24, Cras discloses:

a syntax pattern selector module for selecting a syntax pattern (Page 15, paragraph [0428]), i.e.

quick parsing checks only the syntax of components, that means the system verifies that the object used in the cadenza object definition exists in the universe definition or in the olap database

corresponding to a desired function (Page 15, Paragraph [0435]), i.e.

an object that contains an error of syntax in its definition due to the use of an unknown function

a statement assembly module (Page 15, Paragraph [0490]), i.e.

query technique (QT) is responsible for accessing metadata . . . provides a semantic layer for building SQL queries

for populating (Page 9, Paragraph [0229]), i.e.

to aggregate the data or group the members

the syntax pattern (Page 15, Paragraph [0428]) with an argument data set associated with a desired data set (Page 8, Paragraph [0193]), i.e.

The metadata object,---- are objects that define a data source

and whereby at least one query language statement is assembled to be run against a data source (Page 16, Paragraph [0490]; se also (Page 1, Paragraph [0011]; see also Page 5, Paragraph [0106]; see also Page 5, Paragraph [0111]; see also Page

11, Paragraph [0291]; see also Page 16, Paragraph [0463]; see also Page 16, Paragraphs [0465], [0467], [0476], [0477], [0481], [0482] and [0485]; see also (Page 17, Paragraph [0504]), i.e.

A SQL expert can craft "user defined SQL filters" specific to a database SQL compliance

Cras reference discloses all of the claimed subject matter set forth above, except it does not explicitly indicate the a function identifier module for identifying a functional element correspond to the desired function and at least one syntax pattern.

However, Petculescu discloses a function identifier module for identifying a functional element correspond to the desired function and at least one syntax pattern (Figure No. 4, and corresponding text).

Given the intended broad application of the Cras's system, It would have been obvious to a person of ordinary skill in the art at the time of Applicant's invention to modify the teachings of Cras with the teachings of Petculescu to include the functional identifier in order to allow for a maximum system flexibility by providing the option to identify a function, for example, in Petculescu Figure No. 4, the option to execute the query syntax locally or remotely.

Points of Contact

8. Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to Haythim J. Alaubaidi whose telephone number is (571) 272-4014. The examiner can normally be reached on Monday - Friday from 8:00 AM to 4:30 PM.

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, Safet Metjahic, can be reached on (571) 272-4023.


Any response to this office action should be mailed to:

The Commissioner of Patents and Trademarks, Washington, D.C. 20231 or telefax at our fax number (703) 872-9306.

Hand-delivered response should be brought to Crystal Park II, 2121 Crystal Drive, 6th Floor Receptionist, Arlington, Virginia. 22202.

Haythim J. Alaubaidi

Patent Examiner
Technology Center 2100
Art Unit 2161
December 19, 2004


SAFET METJAHIC
SENIOR PATENT EXAMINER
TECHNOLOGY CENTER 2100